DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 014 SO 008 439

AUTHOR Johnston, Denis F.
TITLE National Social Indicator Reports: Some Comparisons and Prospects.
PUB DATE Jun 75
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the General Assembly of the World Future Society (2nd, Washington, D.C., June 2-5, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Comparative Testing; Cross Cultural Studies; Data Bases; Data Collection; Information Sources; *International Programs; National Norms; *National Surveys; *Social Change; *Sociocultural Patterns; Statistical Data; *Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Social Indicators

ABSTRACT

This report provides comparisons among the social indicator reports of seven countries including Canada, France, Great Britain, Japan, Norway, the United States, and West Germany. The purpose of social indicator research in each country is to provide a means for developing more adequate answers to the questions over present and emerging social trends. Limitations of the social indicator reports are that at best the data are purely descriptive of broadly aggregate trends and can provide only a general perspective of the emerging trends. The appendix is a comparison chart of social-concern coverage reports of the seven countries on 12 areas of social concern including population characteristics; family characteristics; housing and community characteristics; social welfare and security of the population; health and nutrition; public safety and legal justice; education and training; work; income, wealth, and expenditures; leisure, recreation, and cultural activity; social mobility and social participation; and miscellaneous areas. (Author/DR)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NATIONAL SOCIAL INDICATOR REPORTS *
-- Some Comparisons and Prospects --

Denis F. Johnston **

National "social indicator" reports, taking the term in a liberal sense, have already been issued (or are about to be issued) by at least ten countries: Canada, France, Great Britain, Japan, Malaysia, Norway, The Philippines, Sweden, the United States, and West Germany. 1/ Three of these countries have issued more than one report on an annual basis -- Great Britain has issued five Social Trend reports since 1970; the Federal Republic of Germany has issued two (in 1973 and 1974); France has issued two (in 1973 and 1974). In addition, several countries are now in the initial planning stages for similar reports to be issued in the future and such plans are being developed and coordinated by United Nations agencies and by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). 2/

---

* A paper presented at the Second General Assembly of the World Future Society, Washington, D.C., June 2-5, 1975.

** Dr. Johnston is Director, Social Indicators Project, Statistical Policy Division, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President. The views expressed herein are solely the author's.

1/ References to these reports are listed on pages 5 and 6 of the following chart. (See Appendix, pp. 13ff.)

2/ For summaries of these efforts, see the United Nations Economic and Social Council, International Guidelines for Social Indicators (CES/WP.34/14, 29 April 1974) and Social Indicators (E/CN.5/515, 2 January 1975); also, OECD, List of Social Concerns Common to Most OECD Countries (Paris: OECD, 1973).

Comparison of the content and organization of these reports (in particular, the eight reports covered in the following chart) reveals a number of significant differences, both in concept and in coverage. Nevertheless, the fact that these reports can be compared, albeit crudely, with respect to their treatment of broad areas of social concern suggests that while the "social indicator movement" is still in a formative stage, a firm substratum of generally accepted areas of social concern has been formed and a somewhat shakier but growing superstructure of indicators is gradually being developed. 3/

The United States effort

The general objectives of the U.S. national social indicator reports may best be summarized by quoting the pertinent recommendations of the President's Commission on Federal Statistics: 4/

> "Quantitative social information (indicators) is required for: (1) the establishment of social goals and priorities; (2) the evaluation of public programs; (3) the development of a system of social accounts that could provide guidance among alternative interventions; and (4) increasing our knowledge of the functioning of society and enhancing our capability in social prediction."

This Commission's report also described the three types of social indicators needed to satisfy these requirements. First, problem-oriented

---

3/ The comparisons which follow are based upon the writer's examination of the reports covered, together with the following sources: Roxann A. Van Dusen, "International Social Indicators -- an overview of on-going activities," a paper prepared for discussion at the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, March 21, 1974; Wolfgang Zapf, "Social Indicators, 1973: Comparison with Social Reports of Other Nations," and Natalie Rogoff Ramsey, "Social Indicators in the United States and Europe: Comments on Five Country Reports," in Roxann A. Van Dusen (ed), Social Indicators 1973: A Review Symposium (Washington, D.C.: Social Science Research Council Center for

(con. on next page)

or direct policy-relevant indicators are needed for the purposes of informing policy decisions and evaluating on-going programs. Second, descriptive indicators are needed in order to assess both the current status of society and the trends and changes occurring through time. Third, analytic indicators are called for -- i.e., measures which reflect the functional interrelations of major components of explicit conceptual models of a specified social system or sub-system.

Given this heady prescription of goals and aspirations, it is small wonder that the "social indicators movement" appears to be expanding exponentially. But the constraints which surround the development of national social indicator reports are equally clear. Given the limitations of the available data and the prevailing "state of the art," it is evident that the bulk of the information which can readily be assembled in a national social indicator report is, at best, purely descriptive of broadly aggregate trends in the major concern-areas. However ingeniously such information is selected and assembled, it can only provide a general perspective on emerging national trends and current conditions in the major areas of concern.

The first U.S. report, Social Indicators 1973, remains unique in several respects. It was the first to use the term "social indicators"

3/ -- con. Coordination of Research on Social Indicators, 1974) pp. 20-40 and 41-62, respectively.

4/ President's Commission on Federal Statistics, Federal Statistics, Vol. II, chapter 7, "Social Reporting for the 1970's" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971) pp. 403-435.

as a title. It was also unique in placing primary emphasis upon the graphic display of the selected data -- the tables, technical notes, and supportive text were designed to provide only the minimum necessary background information. Finally, it was distinctive (if not unique) in attempting to delineate the criteria whereby certain social statistics could be selected as "social indicators." The first criterion was that the data should measure individual (or family) well-being, rather than the "well-being" or condition of various social institutions. Second, the data should relate to the end-products of social systems or institutions rather than the inputs to these systems. As it turned out, neither of these criteria was sufficiently explicit to provide clear guidelines for data selection or exclusion. Furthermore, the limitations of the available data base necessitated the selection of much data as proxies for the measures which would ideally be preferred.

The second U.S. report, Social Indicators, 1976, is currently envisioned as broadly similar to the first report in its general format. Graphic displays will again be emphasized, although some sacrifice of esthetic appeal may be necessary in the interests of providing additional information. The focus on individual (and family) well-being is being retained, and in fact somewhat strengthened by the inclusion of a new chapter on the family. However, we hope to be able to extend the criteria for social indicator selection so as to incorporate data relating to "system concerns" and "satisfaction

concerns" in addition to "well-being concerns." 5/ The report is being organized in three parts, as follows:

Part I. (Introduction). This part will include a statement of the concept of social indicators, the objectives of the Social Indicator Project, and brief guidelines on how to use the report. It will also include a narrative summary of the "quality of life" of selected population groups -- age groups and ethnic minorities -- as revealed by a limited selection of available indicators, drawn largely from the results of the past three decennial censuses.

Part II. (Social Indicators). This part will consist of eleven chapters, presented in the order shown in the following chart. Each chapter will include a brief introduction, a set of graphs (and maps, where appropriate) and a set of tables providing basic data.

Part III. (Appendices). Four appendices are planned: Appendix A, Technical Notes and Definitions; Appendix B, Quality of the Data (a summary of available information on sampling variability and certain types of non-sampling error affecting the principal data series); Appendix C, Sources and References for further reading; and Appendix D, an index to the report as a whole.

International Comparisons (See Appendix, pp. 13ff.)

As is evident from the following chart, Social Indicators 1976 promises to cover a broader range of social concerns than the first

---

5/ As Zapf defines these terms, "well-being concerns" relate to final outputs that characterize the circumstances, life chances and capacities of individuals, families, or households. "System concerns"

(con. nn next page)

U.S. report. In so doing, it will correspond more closely with its Canadian and some of its European counterparts, but at the sacrifice of its distinctive focus on individual well-being. With respect, first, to "well-being" concerns, the addition of three new chapters (the family, social welfare and security, and social mobility and participation) should permit the inclusion of some indicators of well-being which could not be provided in the first report. In addition, it is hoped that the selection of a few summary indicators of well-being for different age and ethnic groups will permit some assessment of the relative well-being of these groups over time. Second, the coverage of "system" concerns will be strengthened somewhat and will be presented as an explicit section in each chapter, rather than being merged with well-being concerns. Third, insofar as "satisfaction" concerns can be captured by presenting selected time-series of opinion survey data, these concerns will receive greatly expanded coverage. It is hoped that one or more "opinion" items can be obtained from existing Roper, Gallup, NORC and other survey data files for each of the social indicator chapters.

One final feature of the forthcoming U.S. report is clearly distinctive. We hope to provide, in Appendix B, a summary of available information on the quality of the data. Such information has not been

---

5/ -- con. relate to institutional features that are important as means to produce final outputs. "Satisfaction concerns," finally, are subjective evaluations by individuals, families and households of the output and the institutions relevant to their well-being." Wolfgang Zapf, Op. Cit., pp. 26f.

provided in any of the reports under review, excepting in the form of a few scattered comments in the technical notes or in footnotes to the charts and tables. One problem yet to be resolved in this regard is the treatment of data whose associated errors have not been estimated. We do not wish to convey the impression that data whose associated errors can be summarized are less reliable than data whose errors are unknown -- when the reverse is probably closer to the mark.

Before turning to a brief consideration of possible future developments and potential uses of social indicators, it may be appropriate to enter a modest word of caution. National social indicator reports can only serve a limited set of objectives. The data and measures they contain must be carefully selected and highly aggregated. One must look elsewhere to find the latest research findings or discussions of the newest research techniques. But as these findings and techniques give rise to new and improved data sets and related measures, they should eventually be reflected in the content of future social indicator reports. Meanwhile, these reports are intended to promote a wider appreciation of the perspectives afforded by the juxtaposition of social indicators relating to the different areas of concern. If, in addition, they inspire similar efforts relating to sub-national areas or particular population groups, they will help to motivate a fuller utilization of the findings of social science research and greater efforts toward the improvement of our data base.

Social Indicators and Social Forecasting

It is evident that social indicators mean different things to different people and that their potential uses are highly varied, if not contradictory. If we assume that each of the major attempts to define social indicators enjoys some legitimacy, it follows that no single line of development is likely to absorb the full energies devoted to their future development. To begin with, the field has certainly aroused the interests of the community of quantitatively-oriented social scientists. To the model-builders and systems analysts, social indicators are a sub-set of social statistics and measures which reflect the observed or estimated values of specified variables and their mutual effects, both static (in time) and dynamic (through time). Their selection is therefore a function of the models which may be specified on the basis of some theoretical understanding of the particular social system or sub-system in question. 6/

This conceptualization is of course entirely consistent with the conventional methods of quantitative social research and its objectives are the classical goals of improved understanding and, ultimately, improved predictive power. The gradual accumulation of experience with

---

6/ For a useful summary of this approach, see Kenneth C. Land, "Social indicator models: an overview," in Kenneth C. Land and Seymour Spilerman (eds), Social Indicator Models (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1975) pp. 5-36. Also informative is Edgar S. Dunn, Jr., Social Information Processing and Statistical Systems -- Change and Reform (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974), chapter 5.

these system-constructs (ranging from highly restricted models of particular sub-systems to the all-encompassing social system models or "accounting schemes" envisioned by the architects of the U.N.'s draft proposal, "Towards a System of Social and Demographic Statistics") may be expected to yield further insights into the interrelations among different measures of socio-economic phenomena. These insights should, in turn, provide theoretical guidance in identifying functions for which appropriate indicators might be devised and in examining available indicators within a more fruitful analytical framework. In addition, these system-constructs may yield significant pay-offs in the form of simulations under experimentally controlled conditions whereby the probable "costs," "benefits," and "side-effects" of specified policy interventions may be estimated at minimal cost. 7/

A second and more modest line of development involves the development of illustrative projections of selected time-series of descriptive indicators (or proxy measures), using both the conventional "period" data and cohort analysis. Despite our unfortunate experiences (in a world which is very seldom "surprise-free") with socio-economic and

---

7/ For recent examples of both "macro" and "micro" model development, see Karl A. Fox, Social Indicators and Social Theory (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974). For the efforts of international agencies, see Richard Stone, Demographic Accounting and Model-Building (Paris: OECD, 1971) and United Nations, Office of the Secretary-General, "System of Social and Demographic Statistics (SSDS), Potential uses and usefulness," (E/CN.3/449, 19 June 1974) and "System of Social and Demographic Statistics (SSDS), Draft guidelines on social indicators," (E/CN.3/450, 26 April 1974).

demographic projections, the fact remains that any rational effort to formulate policies and related programs is necessarily future-oriented and must therefore reflect some systematic appraisal of the future environment in which these policies are to take effect. Thus the policy-relevance of social indicators may be enhanced if they can be projected on the basis of alternative sets of explicit assumptions, so as to place them in the same temporal context as the policies which are being considered. Alternative projections (as distinct from predictions or forecasts) obviously cannot dictate policy decisions. But they can inform the decision-process by describing the probable or possible consequences of a continuation of observed trends and of the possible responsiveness of these trends to different sets of postulated conditions. As Dennis Gabor has aptly stated, "the future cannot be predicted, but futures can be invented." 8/

Finally, there is the hope that the original concept which inspired the "social indicators movement" will not be entirely abandoned in the search for scientific generalizations and predictive capabilities. The one element that most clearly differentiates social indicators from the broader set of social information is their normative significance. It is this element that explains the on-going efforts, in the OECD and elsewhere, to derive these indicators from a prior delineation of areas of social concern or social goals. It is also this element which underlies their potential

---

8/ Dennis Gabor, Inventing the Future (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin-Pelican Books, Ltd., 1964) p. 161.

relevance to those many individuals who must exercise some role, however modest, in the formulation of public and private policies. 9/ The fact that values are changeable does not alter their primary role in the assessment of the current state of society and in the formulation of policies designed to influence its future development. Decision-making is inherently meaningless except insofar as it is an expression of particular values; the purpose of any rational decision is to bridge the gap between one's current situation and some preferred state; but such a gap cannot be perceived nor can a preferred state be specified, except in terms of one's values. The development of social indicators which describe the "well-being" of individuals and primary groups, and of those which reflect their own perceptions and evaluations of their condition and prospects may add little to our powers of prediction, but they should at least provide an essential supplement to our conventional measures of economic production. 10/

The objective of normative assessment gives rise to a need for indicators which would add further dimensionality to the conventional accounting schemes of "objective" socio-economic and demographic data. For example, Angus Campbell has recommended the development of indicators

---

9/ On this point, see David E. Christian, "Social Indicators -- The OECD Experience," (Paris: OECD, June 1974) and his expanded discussion, "International Social Indicators: The OECD Experience," Social Indicators Research, 1:2 (Sept. 1974) pp. 169-186.

10/ See Frank M. Andrews, "Social Indicators of Perceived Life Quality," Social Indicators Research, 1:3 (Dec. 1974), pp. 279-299.

which would reflect changes in levels of aspiration, levels of group attachment, and levels of isolation, alienation, or 'anomie.' 11/ Taken together, such indicators might provide a basis for societal evaluation independent of its measured levels of material affluence or efficiency in performing specified functions.

From the viewpoint of futures research, social indicators may be regarded as a means for developing more adequate answers to the age-old questions: "What are we, what are we in the process of becoming, and do we like what we see?" Any attempt to answer these questions is certainly a problematic venture; but equally certain is that such questions cannot be denied, nor can they be answered adequately in terms of our conventional economic measures of output and productivity. 12/

11/ Angus Campbell, "Social Accounting in the 1970's," Michigan Law Review, 23:1 (Jan. 1971) pp. 2-7. Also see his "Aspiration, Satisfaction, and Fulfillment," in Angus Campbell and Philip E. Converse (eds), The Human Meaning of Social Change (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1972) pp. 441-466. Campbell, Converse, and Willard L. Rogers are currently completing a more elaborate study in this area, entitled "The Perceived Quality of Life." For additional perspectives, see Burkhard Strumpel (ed), Subjective Elements of Well-Being (Paris: OECD, 1974).

12/ For perceptive comments on the problematic relations between social indicators and social policy, see Peter J. Henriot, "Political Questions about Social Indicators," Western Political Quarterly, 23 (June 1970) pp. 235-255; Bertram M. Gross and Jeffrey D. Straussman, "The Social Indicators Movement," Social Policy, 5:3 (Sept./Oct. 1974) pp.43-54; and Dennis L. Little, "Social indicators and public policy," Futures, 7:1 (Feb.1975) pp. 41-51.

Our cursory review of the contents of the eight reports, as summarized in the Appendix, is in no way an indication of either the kinds or the quality of information which are available in these several countries, but it does demonstrate their shared concern with the need to develop measures of social well-being which could supplement their conventional economic accounts. 13/

It is apparent that little consensus has yet emerged in regard to the detailed content and organization of National social indicator reports. The diversity which is evident reflects both the current "state of the art" and the absence of a clearly defined notion of the audiences of such reports and the ways these reports might be used by these audiences. But diversity is also an indicator in its own right -- it reflects growth and experimentation. In these troubled times, these are hopeful signs.

13/ These comparisons are "unfair" in the sense that some of the reports, such as Social Trends, modify the content of their individual chapters from year to year, so that any single report is not entirely representative of the coverage over time. Other reports, especially that of Japan, have omitted coverage of certain subjects because they are treated in other publications. Finally, it must be noted that the forthcoming United States report, as described herein, is still in the formative stages; the final report may differ substantially from that which is currently envisioned.

APPENDIX

COMPARISON OF SOCIAL-CONCERN COVERAGE [a/]
-- EIGHT REPORTS --

(X = represented; 0 = not represented)

Page 1 of 6

Area of Social Concern [b/]	U.S.A.		GB.	FR.	JA.	CA.	GE.	NO.
Year:	73	76	74	74	73	74	73	74
POPULATION								
A. Well-being concerns:								
Selected population characteristics .	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
B. System concerns:								
Population size and growth	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Fertility, mortality	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Migration, immigration	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Residence, distribution	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
C. Satisfaction concerns:								
Ideal family size	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
Related opinion data	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
THE FAMILY								
A. Well-being concerns:								
Selected family characteristics	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Marital status of population	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Marriage and divorce rates	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
B. System concerns:								
Family size, composition	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Broken homes, unrel. individuals	0	X	X	0	0	X	X	0
C. Satisfaction concerns:								
Satisfaction with family life	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
Related opinion data	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
HOUSING AND COMMUNITY								
A. Well-being concerns:								
Housing quality	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Living space, crowding	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Housing characteristics	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Neighborhood quality, services, etc..	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	X
B. System concerns:								
Housing construction, renewal	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	X
Housing cost and supply	0	0	X	X	X	0	X	X
Housing finances, subsidies	0	0	X	0	X	X	X	X
Housing segregation	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
C. Satisfaction concerns:								
Satisfaction with housing	X	X	0	0	X	0	0	0
Satisfaction with neighborhood	X	X	0	0	X	0	0	0
Related opinion data	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0

a,b/ See notes at end of table.

Comparison of Social-Concern Coverage -- Con. [a]

Page 2 of 6

Area of Social Concern [b]	U.S.A.		GB.	FR.	JA.	CA.	GE.	NC.
Year:	73	76	74	74	73	74	73	74
SOCIAL WELFARE AND SECURITY								
A. Well-being concerns:								
Social security coverage	0	X	X	X	X	0	X	X
Protection against economic hazards.	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Median income of retired persons ...	0	X	0	X	X	0	0	X
B. System concerns:								
Social welfare expenditures	0	X	X	0	X	0	X	0
Private pension & insurance coverage	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Disability insurance coverage	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X
Unemployment insurance coverage	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Other public assistance coverage ...	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
C. Satisfaction concerns:								
Related opinion data	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
HEALTH AND NUTRITION								
A. Well-being concerns:								
Life expectancy	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Disability, by type	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mental health, illness	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Incidence of acute conditions	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	X
Nutritive value of diets	0	X	X	0	0	X	X	0
Incidence of dietary deficiencies ..	0	X	0	0	0	X	0	0
B. System concerns:								
Medical care facilities	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Preventive care, facilities	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	X
Rehabilitation facilities	0	0	X	0	X	X	X	X
C. Satisfaction concerns:								
Confidence in medical services	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
Satisfaction with personal health ..	0	X	0	0	X	0	0	0
Related opinion data	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
PUBLIC SAFETY AND LEGAL JUSTICE								
A. Well-being concerns:								
Reported crimes, by type	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Victimization data	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	X
Criminal offenders, characteristics.	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
B. System concerns:								
Rehabilitation services	0	X	0	X	0	0	X	X
Recidivism	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	0
Proportions of offenses cleared	0	X	X	0	0	X	0	X
The legal justice system	0	0	X	X	0	0	X	0

Comparison of Social-Concern Coverage -- con. [a]

Page 3 of 6

Area of Social Concern [b] / Year:	U.S.A. 73	U.S.A. 76	GB. 74	FR. 74	JA. 73	CA. 74	GE. 73	NO. 74
C. Satisfaction Concerns:								
Fear of crime	X	X	0	0	X	0	0	0
Related opinion data	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
EDUCATION AND TRAINING								
A. Well-being concerns:								
Educational attainment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
School retention rates	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Educational achievement ratings	X	X	X	0	0	0	0	0
Participation in adult education	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	X
Effects of education (income, etc.)	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	0
B. System concerns:								
The educational system, costs, etc.	0	0	X	0	0	X	X	0
School enrollment	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Facilities for continuing education	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	X
Job-related training facilities	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
C. Satisfaction concerns:								
Confidence in educational system	0	X	0	0	0	X	0	0
Related opinion data	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
WORK								
A. Well-being concerns:								
Working conditions	0	0	X	X	0	X	X	X
Hours worked	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Work injuries	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X
Earnings, by occupation	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Union membership	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
B. System concerns:								
Labor force participation	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Unemployment (rates, duration)	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Job vacancies, requirements	0	0	X	0	0	X	X	0
Occupational distribution	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Labor disputes	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	0
Sub-employment, "hidden" unemploy.	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
C. Satisfaction concerns:								
Job satisfaction	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	0
Related opinion data	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
INCOME, WEALTH, AND EXPENDITURES								
A. Well-being concerns:								
Levels and trends in real income	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Income distribution	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Distribution of wealth	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X

Comparison of Social-Concern Coverage -- con. [a]

Page 4 of 6

Area of Social Concern [b]	U.S.A.		GB.	FR.	JA.	CA.	GE.	NO.
Year:	73	76	74	74	73	74	73	74
Personal consumption expenditures ..	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sources of family income	0	X	X	0	X	0	0	0
B. System concerns:								
Income redistribution (transfers) ..	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	0
Poverty	X	X	X	0	0	X	0	0
C. Satisfaction concerns:								
Satisfaction with income vs needs ..	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
Related opinion data	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
LEISURE, RECREATION, AND CULTURAL ACTIVITY								
A. Well-being concerns:								
Time-budgets, use of time	X	X	X	0	0	X	0	X
Use of leisure-time	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X
Work-transportation time	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	X
Flexibility of working time	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	0
Outdoor recreation participation ...	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	0
Vacation time	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
B. System concerns:								
Libraries: stock and circulation ...	0	X	X	0	0	X	0	0
Books published, by field	0	X	0	X	0	0	X	0
Cultural activities, attendance	0	X	X	X	0	X	0	X
C. Satisfaction concerns:								
Related opinion data	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOCIAL MOBILITY AND PARTICIPATION								
A. Well-being concerns:								
Mobility (social or occupational) ..	0	X	0	X	0	0	X	0
Membership in voluntary assoc.	0	X	X	0	0	0	X	X
Degree of social inequality	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0
B. System concerns:								
Voting, political activity	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	X
Voluntary community service	0	X	X	0	0	0	X	X
C. Satisfaction concerns:								
Related opinion data	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER TOPICS								
Technical notes, definitions, etc. .	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Information on quality of the data .	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sources and further references	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X
Index	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	0

Comparison of Social-Concern Coverage -- con. [a]

Page 5 of 6

Area of Social Concern [b] / Year:	U.S.A.		GB.	FR.	JA.	CA.	GE.	NO.
	73	76	74	74	73	74	73	74
Summary indicators of "well-being" .	0	X	0	X	0	0	0	0
Status of minority groups	X	X	0	X	0	X	X	0
Indicators of environmental quality.	0	0	X	0	X	X	0	0
Exposure to pollutants	0	0	X	0	X	X	0	0
Life cycle (or cohort) analyses	0	X	X	0	0	X	0	X
Projections of selected time-series.	X	X	X	0	0	0	0	0
International comparisons	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0
Calendar of significant events	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0

[a] This chart is an expanded adaptation of a similar chart presented in Wolfgang Zapf, "Social Indicators, 1973: Comparison with Social Reports of Other Nations," in Roxann A. Van Dusen (ed), Social Indicators, 1973: A Review Symposium (Washington, D.C.: Social Science Research Council Center for Coordination of Research on Social Indicators, 1974), pp. 20-40. Zapf's analysis covered only two of the reports included above: the United States report, Social Indicators, 1973 (U.S.A. 73) and the report of West Germany, Gesellschaftliche Daten 1973 (GE. 73). In addition to these two reports, Zapf's analysis covered the following reports which were omitted in the above chart: United States, DHEW, Toward a Social Report (1969); O.E.C.D., List of Social Concerns Common to Most OECD Countries (1973); United Kingdom, Social Trends, 1972; and France, Données Sociales, 1973. More recent publications by the latter two countries have been reviewed in the above chart. The writer was assisted by Tobia Bressler of the Bureau of the Census in preparing the above chart.

[b] The major areas of social concern (or "goal areas") are presented in the sequence that is planned for the forthcoming United States report, Social Indicators, 1976 (U.S.A. 76). Again following Zapf, the specific concerns in each area have been organized into three categories: A. Well-being concerns; B. System concerns; and C. Satisfaction concerns.

SOURCES

U.S.A. - 73: Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, Statistical Policy Division, Social Indicators 1973 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973).

U.S.A. - 76: Ibid., Social Indicators, 1976 (publication forthcoming in 1976).

GB. - 74: Great Britain, Central Statistical Office, Social Trends No. 5, 1974. (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1974).

Comparison of Social-Concern Coverage -- con. a/

Page 6 of 6

Sources -- continued.

FR. - 74: France, Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques (INSEE), Données Sociales, edition 1974 (Paris: INSEE, 1974).

JA. - 73: Japan, Whitepaper on National Life, 1973: The Life and Its Quality in Japan (Tokyo: Japanese Government Economic Planning Agency, 1973).

CA. - 74: Canada, Office of the Senior Adviser on Integration, Statistics Canada, Perspective Canada (Ottawa: Information Canada, July 1974).

GE. - 73: Germany (West), Gesellschaftliche Daten 1973 (Bonn: Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 1973).

NO. - 74: Norway, Sosialt Utsyn 1974 (Oslo: Central Bureau of Statistics, 1974).

Additional government publications:

Malaysia: Socio-economic Indicators and National Policy: Malaysia (Malaysia: Department of Statistics, October 1974).

Sweden: Social Utveckling (Stockholm: Statistiska Centralbryan, forthcoming).

The Philippines: Measuring the Quality of Life: Philippine Social Indicators (Manila: Development Academy of the Philippines, 1975).

Measuring Philippine Development (Manila: Development Academy of the Philippines, forthcoming).